

Below is an Opinion of the Court.

  
RANDALL L. DUNN  
U.S. Bankruptcy Judge

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

In Re: ) Bankruptcy Case  
BRADLEY WESTON TAGGART, ) No. 09-39216-rld7  
Debtor. ) MEMORANDUM OPINION

On November 14, 2011, I received evidence and heard testimony and argument at the hearing ("Hearing") on debtor Bradley Weston Taggart's ("Mr. Taggart") Motion to Hold Stuart M. Brown, Terry W. Emmert and Keith Jehnke in Contempt for Violating Discharge Injunction under 11 USC § 524 ("Contempt Motion").<sup>1</sup> Hereafter, Messrs. Brown, Emmert and Jehnke will be referred to collectively as the "Respondents" and individually as "Mr. Brown," "Mr. Emmert" and "Mr. Jehnke," as appropriate. The Hearing was limited to issues as to liability. If I decide the Contempt Motion in favor of Mr. Taggart, a further evidentiary hearing will be scheduled to receive evidence and hear testimony as to

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all chapter and section references are to the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1532, and all "Rule" references are to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, Rules 1001-9037. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are referred to as "Civil Rules."

1 Mr. Taggart's damages. At the conclusion of the Hearing, I took the  
2 matter under advisement.

3 In deciding this matter, I have considered carefully the  
4 testimony presented and the exhibits admitted at the Hearing, as well as  
5 arguments presented, both in legal memoranda and orally. I further have  
6 taken judicial notice of the docket and documents filed in Mr. Taggart's  
7 main chapter 7 case, Case No. 09-39216-rld7 ("Main Case"), for the  
8 purpose of confirming and ascertaining facts not reasonably in dispute.  
9 Federal Rule of Evidence 201; In re Butts, 350 B.R. 12, 14 n.1 (Bankr.  
10 E.D. Pa. 2006). In addition, I have reviewed relevant legal authorities,  
11 both as cited to me by the parties and as located through my own  
12 research.

13 In light of that consideration and review, this Memorandum  
14 Opinion sets forth the court's findings of fact and conclusions of law  
15 under Civil Rule 52(a), applicable with respect to this contested matter  
16 under Rules 7052 and 9014.

#### 17 Factual Background

18 Unfortunately, the proceedings in this court culminating in the  
19 Hearing represent no more than one pitched battle in the longstanding  
20 disputes among the parties and their counsel. It is neither the  
21 beginning, nor I fear, the end. I will refer to the underlying  
22 grievances among them only as necessary to set the stage for the filing  
23 of the Contempt Motion and its aftermath.

24 Mr. Taggart was a general contractor, who operated through a  
25 corporation, Builders, Inc. Mr. Taggart developed several business  
26 parks, anchored by tenants who also were owners. Sherwood Park Business

1 Center, LLC ("SPBC") was formed to build and operate a two-building  
2 business park in Sherwood, Oregon. Its Operating Agreement reflects that  
3 it was organized on or about October 12, 1999. See Exhibit 1, at p. 18.  
4 Initially, SPBC was owned by four members, each with a 25% member  
5 interest: Mr. Taggart, Mr. Jehnke, Mr. John Hoffard and Mr. Anthony  
6 Benthin. See id. at p. 19. Mr. Taggart was designated as the Manager.  
7 See id. at p. 3. Apparently, at some point, Mr. Emmert succeeded to the  
8 member interest of Mr. Benthin in SPBC.

9 In 2004, Mr. Emmert acquired a 50% ownership interest in  
10 Builders, Inc. Thereafter, relations between Mr. Taggart and Mr. Emmert  
11 became contentious, and Mr. Taggart ultimately encouraged three creditors  
12 to file an involuntary bankruptcy petition against Builders, Inc., which  
13 had become insolvent while the SPBC buildings were being constructed.  
14 "When SPBC paid approximately \$33,000 to Builders, Inc. to be used as a  
15 deposit for a steel building, Builders, Inc. used the funds for payroll  
16 instead." Taggart Trial Brief ("Taggart Trial Brief"), Main Case Docket  
17 No. 50, at p. 2. That conduct ultimately resulted in Mr. Taggart being  
18 replaced as the SPBC Manager by Mr. Jehnke. Id.

19 Mr. Taggart's financial condition subsequently deteriorated  
20 further. On July 23, 2007, Mr. Taggart formed BT of Sherwood, LLC ("BT")  
21 and transferred his 25% member interest in SPBC to BT. Mr. Taggart was  
22 represented by attorney John M. Berman ("Mr. Berman") with respect to the  
23 formation of BT and the transfer of Mr. Taggart's member interest in SPBC  
24 to BT. Mr. Berman informed counsel for SPBC that the transfer had been  
25 made. See Exhibit 2. SPBC's counsel responded that Mr. Taggart had no  
26 right to make such a transfer. See Exhibit 3. Mr. Taggart later

1 transferred his entire member interest in BT to Mr. Berman in exchange  
2 for payments totaling \$200,000. See Taggart Trial Brief, at pp.3-4; and  
3 Exhibit 5.

4 On or about September 24, 2008, SPBC filed a complaint  
5 ("Complaint") against Mr. Taggart, BT and Mr. Berman in the Washington  
6 County, Oregon Circuit Court ("Circuit Court"), asserting claims for  
7 breach of fiduciary duty, expulsion, breach of contract, attorney's fees  
8 and declaratory relief (the "Circuit Court Lawsuit"). See Exhibit A. On  
9 or about February 24, 2009, SPBC filed a First Amended Complaint  
10 ("Amended Complaint") in the Circuit Court Lawsuit, asserting essentially  
11 the same claims with elaborating allegations. See Exhibit B.

12 On October 28, 2009, Mr. Taggart filed an answer ("Answer") to  
13 the Amended Complaint, asserting affirmative defenses of failure to state  
14 a claim upon which relief could be granted and claim preclusion and  
15 stating a counterclaim for attorney's fees against SPBC, Mr. Jehnke and  
16 Mr. Emmert. See Exhibit C.

17 In the meantime, Mr. Taggart's financial condition was not  
18 improving. He wanted to be done with SPBC, he wanted to be free of his  
19 connections with Mr. Jehnke and Mr. Emmert, and he had no money to fund  
20 participation in the Circuit Court Lawsuit. On November 4, 2009, the day  
21 that the trial in the Circuit Court Lawsuit was to begin, Mr. Taggart  
22 filed for protection under chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code. See Main  
23 Case Docket No. 1. In his Schedule B list of personal property assets,  
24 Mr. Taggart did not include any interest in either SPBC or BT, but he did  
25 include a potential attorney fee award on his counterclaim in the Circuit  
26 Court Lawsuit. See Exhibit D, at p. 2; Main Case Docket No. 1, Schedule

1 B. The trustee in Mr. Taggart's chapter 7 case filed a report of no  
2 assets available for distribution, and Mr. Taggart received his discharge  
3 by order entered on February 23, 2010. See Main Case Docket Nos. 14 and  
4 15. Apparently, all action in the Circuit Court Lawsuit was stayed while  
5 Mr. Taggart's bankruptcy case was pending.

6 After Mr. Taggart received his discharge, the Circuit Court  
7 Lawsuit was revived. In behalf of Mr. Jehnke and Mr. Emmert, Mr. Brown  
8 subpoenaed Mr. Taggart for a deposition on April 9, 2010. See Exhibit  
9 10. Mr. Berman, in behalf of Mr. Taggart, filed a motion for a  
10 protective order requesting that the subpoena be quashed, supported by  
11 the declaration of Mr. Taggart. See Exhibit E. Mr. Taggart argued that  
12 he already had been subjected to an 8-hour videotaped deposition in the  
13 Circuit Court Lawsuit, and requiring him to submit to a further  
14 deposition in the same case was "harassing, annoying and oppressive."  
15 Id. at p. 2. In the motion for protective order, Mr. Berman requested  
16 attorney's fees in behalf of BT and Mr. Taggart. Id. at p. 3. The  
17 Hearing record is unclear as to the ultimate disposition of the motion  
18 for a protective order: Mr. Taggart testified that the Circuit Court  
19 never ruled on the motion. Mr. Brown testified that it was his  
20 understanding that the Circuit Court denied the motion. In any event,  
21 Mr. Taggart appeared at the deposition and was deposed by an attorney for  
22 Mr. Emmert other than Mr. Brown.

23 The rescheduled trial ("Trial") in the Circuit Court Lawsuit  
24 was set to begin on May 18, 2010. On May 17, 2010, Mr. Berman filed a  
25 Motion to Dismiss and corresponding order to dismiss Mr. Taggart from the  
26 Circuit Court Lawsuit in behalf of Mr. Taggart. See Exhibit 12. Neither

1 the Motion to Dismiss nor the accompanying order referenced Mr. Taggart's  
2 counterclaim for attorney's fees and costs.

3           The Motion to Dismiss was argued on the first day of the Trial.  
4 While counsel for Mr. Jehnke and Mr. Emmert agreed that they would not be  
5 seeking monetary relief against Mr. Taggart, Mr. Brown argued that Mr.  
6 Taggart was a necessary party with respect to the expulsion claim. The  
7 Circuit Court ruled that no money judgment would be entered against Mr.  
8 Taggart but otherwise denied the Motion to Dismiss. See Exhibit 13,  
9 which includes the portion of the Trial transcript relating to the Motion  
10 to Dismiss. No other portion of the Trial transcript was submitted in  
11 evidence at the Hearing. Mr. Brown testified that Mr. Berman orally  
12 renewed the Motion to Dismiss in behalf of Mr. Taggart at the end of the  
13 Trial, and the renewed motion was denied. Mr. Taggart apparently did not  
14 appear or testify at the Trial.

15           Following the Trial, the Circuit Court generally found in favor  
16 of SPBC, and Mr. Brown drafted the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of  
17 Law ("Findings and Conclusions") that the Circuit Court signed. See  
18 Exhibit H. All counterclaims of Mr. Taggart and BT in the Circuit Court  
19 Lawsuit were dismissed with prejudice. See id. at p. 9. The Findings  
20 and Conclusions were entered on July 29, 2010.

21           After a delay of a number of months, Mr. Brown prepared and  
22 submitted a form of judgment in the Circuit Court Lawsuit to which Mr.  
23 Berman objected. The objections to the form of judgment ("Objection to  
24 Judgment") were filed by Mr. Berman as "attorney for Defendants BT of  
25 Sherwood LLC and John Berman." See Exhibit J, particularly at p. 7. Mr.  
26 Taggart testified that Mr. Berman prepared the Objection to Judgment, in

1 part, for him. The Objection to Judgment contains the following, that I  
2 quote at length:

3 The reason that no General Judgment has been submitted  
4 is because as a matter of federal law no attorney fees  
5 or costs, pre- or post-bankruptcy, can be assessed  
6 against Mr. Taggart. Thus, the payment to him for the  
7 25% interest [in SPBC] must be without any such  
8 offsets, as explained infra.

9 Mr. Brown, who submitted this form of General  
10 Judgment, is fully aware that he is asking the Court  
11 to participate in a violation of federal law.  
12 Moreover, he has been told that any attempt to seek  
13 such fees or costs will result in a legal proceeding  
14 against the responsible parties in the Bankruptcy  
15 Court for violation of Mr. Taggart's discharge. It is  
16 up to this Court to decide how it wishes to respond  
17 when an attorney asks it to violate federal law  
18 without even advising this Court that it is being  
19 asked to do so.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1100  
1101  
1102  
1103  
1104  
1105  
1106  
1107  
1108  
1109  
1110  
1111  
1112  
1113  
1114  
1115  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1120  
1121  
1122  
1123  
1124  
1125  
1126  
1127  
1128  
1129  
1130  
1131  
1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144  
1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1289  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298  
1299  
1300  
1301  
1302  
1303  
1304  
1305  
1306  
1307  
1308  
1309  
1310  
1311  
1312  
1313  
1314  
1315  
1316  
1317  
1318  
1319  
1320  
1321  
1322  
1323  
1324  
1325  
1326  
1327  
1328  
1329  
1330  
1331  
1332  
1333  
1334  
1335  
1336  
1337  
1338  
1339  
1340  
1341  
1342  
1343  
1344  
1345  
1346  
1347  
1348  
1349  
1350  
1351  
1352  
1353  
1354  
1355  
1356  
1357  
1358  
1359  
1360  
1361  
1362  
1363  
1364  
1365  
1366  
1367  
1368  
1369  
1370  
1371  
1372  
1373  
1374  
1375  
1376  
1377  
1378  
1379  
1380  
1381  
1382  
1383  
1384  
1385  
1386  
1387  
1388  
1389  
1390  
1391  
1392  
1393  
1394  
1395  
1396  
1397  
1398  
1399  
1400  
1401  
1402  
1403  
1404  
1405  
1406  
1407  
1408  
1409  
1410  
1411  
1412  
1413  
1414  
1415  
1416  
1417  
1418  
1419  
1420  
1421  
1422  
1423  
1424  
1425  
1426  
1427  
1428  
1429  
1430  
1431  
1432  
1433  
1434  
1435  
1436  
1437  
1438  
1439  
1440  
1441  
1442  
1443  
1444  
1445  
1446  
1447  
1448  
1449  
1450  
1451  
1452  
1453  
1454  
1455  
1456  
1457  
1458  
1459  
1460  
1461  
1462  
1463  
1464  
1465  
1466  
1467  
1468  
1469  
1470  
1471  
1472  
1473  
1474  
1475  
1476  
1477  
1478  
1479  
1480  
1481  
1482  
1483  
1484  
1485  
1486  
1487  
1488  
1489  
1490  
1491  
1492  
1493  
1494  
1495  
1496  
1497  
1498  
1499  
1500  
1501  
1502  
1503  
1504  
1505  
1506  
1507  
1508  
1509  
1510  
1511  
1512  
1513  
1514  
1515  
1516  
1517  
1518  
1519  
1520  
1521  
1522  
1523  
1524  
1525  
1526  
1527  
1528  
1529  
1530  
1531  
1532  
1533  
1534  
1535  
1536  
1537  
1538  
1539  
1540  
1541  
1542  
1543  
1544  
1545  
1546  
1547  
1548  
1549  
1550  
1551  
1552  
1553  
1554  
1555  
1556  
1557  
1558  
1559  
1560  
1561  
1562  
1563  
1564  
1565  
1566  
1567  
1568  
1569  
1570  
1571  
1572  
1573  
1574  
1575  
1576  
1577  
1578  
1579  
1580  
1581  
1582  
1583  
1584  
1585  
1586  
1587  
1588  
1589  
1590  
1591  
1592  
1593  
1594  
1595  
1596  
1597  
1598  
1599  
1600  
1601  
1602  
1603  
1604  
1605  
1606  
1607  
1608  
1609  
1610  
1611  
1612  
1613  
1614  
1615  
1616  
1617  
1618  
1619  
1620  
1621  
1622  
1623  
1624  
1625  
1626  
1627  
1628  
1629  
1630  
1631  
1632  
1633  
1634  
1635  
1636  
1637  
1638  
1639  
1640  
1641  
1642  
1643  
1644  
1645  
1646  
1647  
1648  
1649  
1650  
1651  
1652  
1653  
1654  
1655  
1656  
1657  
1658  
1659  
1660  
1661  
1662  
1663  
1664  
1665  
1666  
1667  
1668  
1669  
1670  
1671  
1672  
1673  
1674  
1675  
1676  
1677  
1678  
1679  
1680  
1681  
1682  
1683  
1684  
1685  
1686  
1687  
1688  
1689  
1690  
1691  
1692  
1693  
1694  
1695  
1696  
1697  
1698  
1699  
1700  
1701  
1702  
1703  
1704  
1705  
1706  
1707  
1708  
1709  
1710  
1711  
1712  
1713  
1714  
1715  
1716  
1717  
1718  
1719  
1720  
1721  
1722  
1723  
1724  
1725  
1726  
1727  
1728  
1729  
1730  
1731  
1732  
1733  
1734  
1735  
1736  
1737  
1738  
1739  
1740  
1741  
1742  
1743  
1744  
1745  
1746  
1747  
1748  
1749  
1750  
1751  
1752  
1753  
1754  
1755  
1756  
1757  
1758  
1759  
1760  
1761  
1762  
1763  
1764  
1765  
1766  
1767  
1768  
1769  
1770  
1771  
1772  
1773  
1774  
1775  
1776  
1777  
1778  
1779  
1780  
1781  
1782  
1783  
1784  
1785  
1786  
1787  
1788  
1789  
1790  
1791  
1792  
1793  
1794  
1795  
1796  
1797  
1798  
1799  
1800  
1801  
1802  
1803  
1804  
1805  
1806  
1807  
1808  
1809  
1810  
1811  
1812  
1813  
1814  
1815  
1816  
1817  
1818  
1819  
1820  
1821  
1822  
1823  
1824  
1825  
1826  
1827  
1828  
1829  
1830  
1831  
1832  
1833  
1834  
1835  
1836  
1837  
1838  
1839  
1840  
1841  
1842  
1843  
1844  
1845  
1846  
1847  
1848  
1849  
1850  
1851  
1852  
1853  
1854  
1855  
1856  
1857  
1858  
1859  
1860  
1861  
1862  
1863  
1864  
1865  
1866  
1867  
1868  
1869  
1870  
1871  
1872  
1873  
1874  
1875  
1876  
1877  
1878  
1879  
1880  
1881  
1882  
1883  
1884  
1885  
1886  
1887  
1888  
1889  
1890  
1891  
1892  
1893  
1894  
1895  
1896  
1897  
1898  
1899  
1900  
1901  
1902  
1903  
1904  
1905  
1906  
1907  
1908  
1909  
1910  
1911  
1912  
1913  
1914  
1915  
1916  
1917  
1918  
1919  
1920  
1921  
1922  
1923  
1924  
1925  
1926  
1927  
1928  
1929  
1930  
1931  
1932  
1933  
1934  
1935  
1936  
1937  
1938  
1939  
1940  
1941  
1942  
1943  
1944  
1945  
1946  
1947  
1948  
1949  
1950  
1951  
1952  
1953  
1954  
1955  
1956  
1957  
1958  
1959  
1960  
1961  
1962  
1963  
1964  
1965  
1966  
1967  
1968  
1969  
1970  
1971  
1972  
1973  
1974  
1975  
1976  
1977  
1978  
1979  
1980  
1981  
1982  
1983  
1984  
1985  
1986  
1987  
1988  
1989  
1990  
1991  
1992  
1993  
1994  
1995  
1996  
1997  
1998  
1999  
2000  
2001  
2002  
2003  
2004  
2005  
2006  
2007  
2008  
2009  
2010  
2011  
2012  
2013  
2014  
2015  
2016  
2017  
2018  
2019  
2020  
2021  
2022  
2023  
2024  
2025  
2026  
2027  
2028  
2029  
2030  
2031  
2032  
2033  
2034  
2035  
2036  
2037  
2038  
2039  
2040  
2041  
2042  
2043  
2044  
2045  
2046  
2047  
2048  
2049  
2050  
2051  
2052  
2053  
2054  
2055  
2056  
2057  
2058  
2059  
2060  
2061  
2062  
2063  
2064  
2065  
2066  
2067  
2068  
2069  
2070  
2071  
2072  
2073  
2074  
2075  
2076  
2077  
2078  
2079  
2080  
2081  
2082  
2083  
2084  
2085  
2086  
2087  
2088  
2089  
2090  
2091  
2092  
2093  
2094  
2095  
2096  
2097  
2098  
2099  
2100  
2101  
2102  
2103  
2104  
2105  
2106  
2107  
2108  
2109  
2110  
2111  
2112  
2113  
2114  
2115  
2116  
2117  
2118  
2119  
2120  
2121  
2122  
2123  
2124  
2125  
2126  
2127  
2128  
2129  
2130  
2131  
2132  
2133  
2134  
2135  
2136  
2137  
2138  
2139  
2140  
2141  
2142  
2143  
2144  
2145  
2146  
2147  
2148  
2149  
2150  
2151  
2152  
2153  
2154  
2155  
2156  
2157  
2158  
2159  
2160  
2161  
2162  
2163  
2164  
2165  
2166  
2167  
2168  
2169  
2170  
2171  
2172  
2173  
2174  
2175  
2176  
2177  
2178  
2179  
2180  
2181  
2182  
2183  
2184  
2185  
2186  
2187  
2188  
2189  
2190  
2191  
2192  
2193  
2194  
2195  
2196  
2

1 him.

2 That was the express holding in In re Ybarra, 424  
3 F.[.]3d 1018 (2005), a copy of which is attached to  
4 this brief. It held that where a litigant actively  
5 asserts claims in litigation post-petition, only then  
6 can he be assessed post-petition attorney fees,  
7 overruling In re Ybarra, 295 BR 609 (USBAP, 2002),  
8 which held that even then attorney fees could not be  
9 awarded.

10 As explained in the Ninth Circuit's decision, and  
11 there are numerous other cases that have so held in  
12 other jurisdictions, when one is discharged in  
13 bankruptcy from liability, including liability  
14 associated with prepetition litigation, the fact that  
15 the litigation continues without any involvement by  
16 the discharged debtor means that no attorney fees or  
17 costs on account of those claims can be asserted  
18 against the discharged debtor. His right to a fresh  
19 start is preeminent.

20 The relevant fact is whether the discharged  
21 debtor asserted claims in this case post-petition. He  
22 did not. Here Taggart did not do so, but actively  
23 sought to be dismissed from the case.

24 In addition, the reference to deducting from the  
25 payment to be made to Taggart any fees or costs in  
26 this or the Bankruptcy Court is improper, not only for  
the above reasons, but also because it suggests that  
this court has some authority to assess attorney fees  
incurred in some unspecified later bankruptcy court  
proceeding, or some other proceeding in this court,  
and to deduct them from what Taggart is owed, for  
which there is absolutely no basis. Rather, Messrs.  
Jehnke and Emmert have no legal basis for their  
claims. They just don't want to pay for what they say  
they want to buy. This is not an option.

The italicized portion of the judgment quote[d]  
above violates federal law and must be stricken.

20 Id. at pp. 1-4.

21 The Objection to Judgment further states:

22 The payments must be paid to seller. There is no  
23 provision in the Operating Agreement for any escrow  
24 account. Messrs. Jehnke and Emmert want to be the  
25 owners of the 25% that Mr. Taggart had owned. They  
26 have to pay for it, and they have to pay Mr. Taggart  
for it. Otherwise, Mr. Taggart would be entitled to  
the rights of an owner, which Messrs. Emmert and  
Jehnke have said terminated on January 1, 2008.



1 Id. at p. 6.

2           On May 2, 2011, the Circuit Court held a hearing ("Judgment  
3 Hearing") on the form of judgment to be entered in the Circuit Court  
4 Lawsuit. Mr. Taggart appeared at the Judgment Hearing, purportedly  
5 representing himself. See Exhibit K, at p.1. Mr. Berman also appeared,  
6 representing himself and BT, but he stated to the Circuit Court that Mr.  
7 Taggart "consents to what I am proposing." Id. Much of the argument  
8 focused on when interest would begin to run on the value of Mr. Taggart's  
9 SPBC membership interest to be sold and how proceeds to Mr. Taggart from  
10 such sale would be distributed. See Exhibit K, at pp.2-14. When Mr.  
11 Taggart was called upon to address the Circuit Court, he stated the  
12 following:

13           MR. TAGGART: Only - the only thing I'd like to say,  
14 Your Honor, is that if - if the date is in 2008, then  
15 they do - I feel they owe interest on that date. If  
16 it's not, then I -I deserved the - the tax benefit  
17 from that period of time. They can't have their cake  
18 and eat it too, in my opinion, so -

19           THE COURT: Very well.

20           MR. TAGGART: Fair is fair. Regarding the bankruptcy,  
21 my bankruptcy was discharged before you made your  
22 decision. There have been considerable payments made  
23 on the taxes already. We don't know what's the totals  
24 of those right now. My feeling is that any money that  
25 comes out of this should go into either an escrow  
26 account or Mr. Berman's trust account until we  
determine exactly what that number is. They're  
hopefully not going to be receiving a hundred percent  
of the proceeds, so -

27 Id. at p. 16.

28           The General Judgment ("Judgment") in the Circuit Court Lawsuit  
29 was entered on May 26, 2011. See Exhibit L. The Judgment contained the  
30 following specific provisions with respect to Mr. Taggart:

31           (1) Brad Taggart's attempted transfer of his

1 membership interest in [SPBC] to [BT] violated the  
2 Operating Agreement and Oregon law. The transfer is  
hereby deemed null and void.

3 (2) Brad Taggart engaged in wrongful conduct as a  
4 member of [SPBC]. Brad Taggart is hereby expelled  
5 from [SPBC] effective January 1, 2008.

6 (3) Counterclaim Defendants Emmert and Jehnke have  
7 timely elected to purchase Taggart's 25% membership  
8 interest. Pursuant to Section 12.5 of the Operating  
9 Agreement, the other remaining members of [SPBC],  
10 Keith Jehnke and Terry W. Emmert, are entitled to  
11 purchase Brad Taggart's 25% membership interest in  
[SPBC] as follows:

12 The purchase price shall be the fair market value  
13 of the Company as of the date of entry of Judgment  
14 multiplied by Taggart's 25% membership interest, less  
15 any unpaid post-bankruptcy petition attorney fees,  
16 costs and prevailing party fees which might be  
17 assessed against Taggart pursuant to ORCP 68 and ORS  
Chapter 20 and any necessary proceedings in bankruptcy  
court or this court.

18 The fair market value shall be determined by a  
19 third-party appraiser acceptable to Jehnke, Emmert and  
20 Taggart. Within 90 days of the valuation, Jehnke and  
21 Emmert shall pay twenty percent of the purchase price  
22 as a downpayment, and the balance shall be paid in 60  
23 substantially equal, consecutive monthly payments,  
24 including principal and interest. Interest shall  
25 accrue from the date of closing at the prime rate  
26 quoted by Wells Fargo Bank at Portland, Oregon on the  
date that this Judgment is entered. Emmert and Jehnke  
may prepay some or all of the outstanding balance at  
any time without penalty or additional interest.

18 Judgment, Exhibit L, at pp. 1-2.

19 Both Mr. Taggart and BT appealed the Judgment. Mr. Taggart  
20 testified that he is representing himself in the appeal, but he  
21 acknowledged that Mr. Berman assisted him in preparing the Notice of  
22 Appeal. See Exhibit O.

23 Thereafter, Mr. Brown filed a petition for costs and attorney's  
24 fees ("Petition") in behalf of SPBC, Mr. Jehnke and Mr. Emmert in the  
25 Circuit Court Lawsuit. See Exhibit M. The Petition reflected the  
26 understanding that any liability of Mr. Taggart for fees "would be

1 limited to fees incurred after he filed for bankruptcy on November 4,  
2 2009 . . . ,” citing Boeing North American, Inc. v. Ybarra (In re  
3 Ybarra), 424 F.3d 1018 (9th Cir. 2005). Id. at p. 4. At oral argument  
4 on the Petition, Mr. Brown clarified that fees and costs were sought from  
5 Mr. Taggart only for the period following the date of his discharge,  
6 February 23, 2010. See Exhibit R at p. 3 (p. 11 of the hearing  
7 transcript). Mr. Taggart filed objections to the Petition pro se,  
8 supported by a Hearing Memorandum prepared by Mr. Berman as Mr. Taggart’s  
9 attorney. See Exhibit 19. Mr. Brown filed a Reply Memorandum in behalf  
10 of SPBC, Mr. Jehnke and Mr. Emmert. See Exhibit P. Mr. Berman called  
11 and examined Mr. Taggart as a witness at the hearing on the Petition.  
12 See Exhibit R, at pp. 5-6 (pp. 17-21 of the hearing transcript). At the  
13 conclusion of the hearing on the Petition, the Circuit Court took the  
14 matter under advisement.

15 On August 11, 2011, the Circuit Court issued a letter opinion  
16 (“Letter Opinion”) addressing the Petition. See Exhibit Q. The Letter  
17 Opinion states the following with respect to Mr. Taggart:

18 The court notes that In re Ybarra, 424 F[.]3d 1018  
19 (9th Cir. 2005) holds that the trial court has power  
20 to award post-petition attorney fees against a debtor  
21 who continues to pursue litigation post-petition that  
22 had been begun pre-petition. This is consistent with  
23 the federal case law the court reviewed.  
24 Taggart filed an answer that was file stamped October  
25 28, 2009. The answer contained a counterclaim for  
26 attorney fees based on Section 13.6 of the Operating  
Agreement. The answer also sought to have plaintiff’s  
claim to be dismissed against him. This was  
consistent with the oral Motion to Dismiss raised at  
the time of trial. Taggart never abandoned his  
counterclaim for attorney fees. Rather he continued  
to pursue his position post-petition that the  
plaintiff’s claim against him be dismissed which, if  
successful, would have led to Taggart having a

1 contractual right to obtain attorney fees.  
2 The court awards attorney fees in favor of BT of  
3 Sherwood [sic-actually, SPBC] in the amount sought at  
4 oral argument. My notes are difficult to decipher but  
5 I believe that amount was \$44,691.50. (It may be  
6 accurately \$44,611.50 as the ten column is the one I  
7 am having trouble reading.) Costs and disbursements  
8 sought as well as the standard prevailing party fee  
9 are also appropriate.

10 [SPBC] is the prevailing party with respect to Brad  
11 Taggart (as noted above) . . . .

12 Exhibit Q, at pp. 1-2.

13 In the meantime, on July 13, 2011, Mr. Taggart had filed the  
14 Contempt Motion, as supplemented by allegations on August 15, 2011. See  
15 Main Case Docket Nos. 24 and 31-32. Following the filing of opposition  
16 papers and preliminary proceedings, as noted above, the Contempt Motion  
17 proceeded to the evidentiary Hearing on November 14, 2011. See Main Case  
18 Docket No. 63. At the Hearing, Mr. Taggart testified that his deal with  
19 Mr. Berman is if he receives anything for the value of the contested  
20 membership interest in SPBC, the proceeds will be split half to him to  
21 pay tax obligations and half to Mr. Berman.

#### 22 Jurisdiction

23 I have jurisdiction to decide the Contempt Motion under 28  
24 U.S.C. §§ 1334, 157(b)(1) and 157(b)(2)(I) and (O).

#### 25 Discussion

26 The question before me is whether the Respondents violated the  
discharge injunction provided for in § 524(a)(2) by continuing to  
prosecute the Circuit Court Lawsuit against Mr. Taggart to the point of  
requesting an offsetting award of attorney's fees and costs against him  
after he received his discharge in his chapter 7 bankruptcy case.

1 Section 524(a)(2) provides that, "A discharge in a case under this title  
2 - (2) operates as an injunction against the commencement or continuation  
3 of an action, the employment of process, or an act, to collect, recover  
4 or offset any such debt as a personal liability of the debtor, whether or  
5 not discharge of such debt is waived . . . ."

6         Procedurally, an alleged violation of the discharge injunction  
7 is pursued, as in this case, by a motion invoking the contempt remedies  
8 allowed for in § 105(a). See Walls v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., 276 F.3d  
9 502, 509-10 (9th Cir. 2002). In order to be subject to sanctions for  
10 violating the discharge injunction, a party's violation must be  
11 "willful." The Ninth Circuit has adopted a two-part test to determine  
12 whether the willfulness standard has been met: 1) Did the alleged  
13 offending party know that the discharge injunction applied; and 2) did  
14 such party intend the actions that violated the discharge injunction?  
15 See Zilog, Inc. v. Corning (In re Zilog, Inc.), 450 F.3d 996, 1007 (9th  
16 Cir. 2006); Hardy v. United States (In re Hardy), 97 F.3d 1384, 1390 (9th  
17 Cir. 1996). The burden of proof for the moving party is clear and  
18 convincing evidence. See In re Zilog, Inc., 450 F.3d at 1007; Renwick  
19 v. Bennett (In re Bennett), 298 F.3d 1059, 1069 (9th Cir. 2002) ("The  
20 moving party has the burden of showing by clear and convincing evidence  
21 that the contemnors violated a specific and definite order of the  
22 court.").

23         Where litigation is commenced prepetition and is recommenced  
24 postpetition or postdischarge, the Ninth Circuit has set forth the  
25 standards to determine whether the continued prosecution of such  
26 litigation violates the discharge injunction of § 524(a)(2) in Boeing

1 North American, Inc. v. Ybarra (In re Ybarra), 424 F.3d 1018 (9th Cir.  
2 2005). The ultimate question is whether the discharged debtor has  
3 voluntarily "returned to the fray" in the renewed litigation. Siegel v.  
4 Federal Home Loan Mortg. Corp., 143 F.3d 525, 533-34 (9th Cir. 1998).

5 In re Ybarra is the saga of a die-hard litigant who paid the  
6 ultimate price for her belief in her claims. Ms. Ybarra sued her former  
7 employer, Rockwell International Corporation ("Rockwell"), originally in  
8 1988. In her Fifth Amended Complaint, filed in April 1991, Ms. Ybarra  
9 asserted two causes of action against Rockwell: 1) employment  
10 discrimination in violation of California Government Code § 12940; and 2)  
11 violation of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing. In re Ybarra,  
12 424 F.3d at 1020. On December 10, 1991, Ms. Ybarra filed a chapter 11  
13 bankruptcy petition, but she did not disclose her claims against Rockwell  
14 in her schedules. Id. Rockwell first learned of Ms. Ybarra's bankruptcy  
15 case in 1993 and moved to convert the case to chapter 7. Id. Rockwell's  
16 motion was granted, and the case was converted in June 1993. Id.

17 Rockwell negotiated a \$17,500 settlement of Ms. Ybarra's claims  
18 with the chapter 7 trustee, to which Ms. Ybarra objected. Id. However,  
19 the bankruptcy court approved the settlement over Ms. Ybarra's objections  
20 on November 12, 1993. Id. Thereafter, the state court granted the  
21 trustee's and Rockwell's motion to dismiss Ms. Ybarra's lawsuit. Id.

22 In the meantime, Ms. Ybarra had amended her schedule of exempt  
23 property to add her lawsuit against Rockwell. Rockwell objected to her  
24 amended exemption claim, and the bankruptcy court sustained Rockwell's  
25 objection. Id. That decision was reversed by the Bankruptcy Appellate  
26 Panel, which was affirmed by the Ninth Circuit. On remand, the

1 bankruptcy court upheld Ms. Ybarra's exemption claim and gave her the  
2 option of accepting the \$17,500 settlement amount from Rockwell or  
3 proceeding with her lawsuit against Rockwell in state court. Id. She  
4 chose to proceed with her lawsuit.

5         Thereafter, Ms. Ybarra persuaded the state court to set aside  
6 its dismissal order, and the case proceeded on Rockwell's motion for  
7 summary judgment. Id. Summary judgment ultimately was granted in  
8 Rockwell's favor. Rockwell then moved for an award of fees and costs  
9 under California law and was awarded \$456,884.03 against Ms. Ybarra. Id.  
10 at 1020-21.

11         Ms. Ybarra previously had received her discharge in bankruptcy  
12 in May 1998. Rockwell filed a motion in the bankruptcy court for leave  
13 to enforce the state court's award of fees and costs. The bankruptcy  
14 court granted Rockwell's motion to the extent of \$159,030.78, the total  
15 amount of fees and costs incurred by Rockwell after Ms. Ybarra filed her  
16 bankruptcy petition. Id. at 1021. Ms. Ybarra appealed to the Bankruptcy  
17 Appellate Panel, which reversed, "holding that the entire fee and cost  
18 award was discharged in [Ms.] Ybarra's bankruptcy." Id.

19         On further appeal, the Ninth Circuit reversed the Bankruptcy  
20 Appellate Panel, citing Siegel, for its holding that "post-petition  
21 attorney fee awards are not discharged where post-petition, the debtor  
22 voluntarily 'pursue[d] a whole new course of litigation,' commenced  
23 litigation, or 'return[ed] to the fray' voluntarily." Id. at 1024  
24 (quoting Siegel, 143 F.3d at 533-34).

25         Whether attorney fees and costs incurred through the  
26 continued prosecution of litigation initiated pre-  
petition may be discharged depends on whether the

1 debtor has taken affirmative post-petition action to  
2 litigate a prepetition claim and has thereby risked  
the liability of these litigation expenses.

3 In re Ybarra, 424 F.3d at 1026.

4 Both Mr. Taggart and the Respondents have cited In re Ybarra to  
5 me and to the Circuit Court as setting forth the relevant legal standard  
6 to consider whether the Respondents violated the discharge injunction of  
7 § 524(a)(2) in seeking a judgment against Mr. Taggart in the Circuit  
8 Court Litigation, including an award of attorney's fees and costs. Based  
9 on the record before it, and specifically noting the application of In re  
10 Ybarra, the Circuit Court determined that an award of post-petition  
11 attorney's fees against Mr. Taggart was not barred by the discharge  
12 injunction, citing primarily Mr. Taggart's never having abandoned his  
13 counterclaim for attorney's fees in the Circuit Court Litigation. See  
14 Letter Opinion, Exhibit Q, at pp. 1-2.

15 Injunctions issuing from the core jurisdictional authority of  
16 the bankruptcy court are not subject to collateral attack in other  
17 courts. Gruntz v. County of Los Angeles (In re Gruntz), 202 F.3d 1074,  
18 1082 (9th Cir. en Banc 2000) (citing Celotex Corp. v. Edwards, 514 U.S.  
19 300, 313 (1995)). The discharge injunction of § 524(a)(2) is such an  
20 injunction.

21 However, the Ninth Circuit further has held that a state court  
22 is not divested of jurisdiction "to determine the applicability of a  
23 discharge order when discharge in bankruptcy is raised as a defense to a  
24 state cause of action filed in a state court . . . ." McGhan v. Rutz (In  
25 re McGhan), 288 F.3d 1172, 1180 (9th Cir. 2022). Accordingly, a state  
26 court, such as the Circuit Court in this case, has concurrent



1 jurisdiction with this court to interpret the bankruptcy court's  
2 discharge orders, but it has no authority to modify them. See In re  
3 McGhan, 288 F.3d at 1179-80.

4 In Gruntz, where the automatic stay injunction of § 362 was  
5 considered, the Ninth Circuit stated that, "even assuming that the states  
6 had concurrent jurisdiction, their judgment would have to defer to the  
7 plenary power vested in the federal courts over bankruptcy proceedings."  
8 In re Gruntz, 202 F.3d at 1083. The Ninth Circuit applied the same  
9 principle to alleged violations of the discharge injunction of § 524 in  
10 In re McGhan. Accordingly, neither issue preclusion nor the Supreme  
11 Court's Rooker-Feldman doctrine preclude my review of the Circuit Court's  
12 findings and conclusions with respect to the scope and application of the  
13 discharge injunction regarding the Respondents' pursuit of the Judgment  
14 and an award of attorney's fees and costs against Mr. Taggart in the  
15 continued Circuit Court Litigation. See In re McGhan. 288 F.3d at 1181;  
16 In re Gruntz, 202 F.3d at 1083-84. "In short, the state court has  
17 jurisdiction to construe the bankruptcy discharge correctly, but not  
18 incorrectly." Pavelich v. McCormick, Barstow, Sheppard, Wayte & Carruth,  
19 LLP (In re Pavelich), 229 B.R. 777, 784 (9th Cir. BAP 1999). See Huse v.  
20 Huse-Sporsem, A.S. (In re Birting Fisheries, Inc.), 300 B.R. 489, 500  
21 (9th Cir. BAP 2003).

22 What the foregoing authorities do not make clear is, in  
23 circumstances where the state court has applied the correct legal  
24 authority in interpreting this court's discharge order, what standard of  
25 review applies to the state court's fact findings. Ordinarily, the  
26 standard for review of a trial court's fact findings is "clear error."

1 SEC v. Coldicutt, 258 F.3d 939, 941 (9th Cir. 2001); Clear Channel  
2 Outdoor, Inc. v. Knupfer (In re PW, LLC), 391 B.R. 25, 32 (9th Cir. BAP  
3 2008). There are important reasons behind that standard.

4       The rationale for deference to the original finder of  
5       fact is not limited to the superiority of the trial  
6       judge's position to make determinations of credibility  
7       [although that superiority of position is important in  
8       itself]. The trial judge's major role is the  
9       determination of fact, and with experience in  
10      fulfilling that role comes expertise. Duplication of  
11      the trial judge's efforts in the court of appeals  
12      would very likely contribute only negligibly to the  
13      accuracy of fact determination at a huge cost in  
14      diversion of judicial resources. . . . As the court  
15      has stated in a different context, the trial on the  
16      merits should be "the 'main event' . . . rather than a  
17      'tryout on the road.'" Wainwright v. Sykes, 433 U.S.  
18      72, 90 . . . (1977). For these reasons, review of  
19      factual findings under the clearly-erroneous standard  
20      - with its deference to the trier of fact - is the  
21      rule, not the exception.

22 Anderson v. City of Bessemer City, 470 U.S. 564, 574-75 (1985) (emphasis  
23 in original).

24       "A finding is 'clearly erroneous' when although there is  
25       evidence to support it, the reviewing court on the entire evidence is  
26       left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been  
27       committed." United States v. U.S. Gypsum Co., 333 U.S. 364, 395 (1948).  
28       "This standard plainly does not entitle a reviewing court to reverse the  
29       finding of the trier of fact simply because it is convinced that it would  
30       have decided the case differently." Anderson v. City of Bessemer City,  
31       470 U.S. at 573.

32       In this case, after citing In re Ybarra, the Circuit Court  
33       found that it was appropriate to award postpetition attorney's fees  
34       against Mr. Taggart as an offset to the purchase price for his member

1 interest in SPBC because Mr. Taggart had never abandoned his own  
2 counterclaim for attorney's fees in the Circuit Court Litigation. See  
3 Letter Opinion, Exhibit Q, at pp. 1-2. At oral argument on the Petition,  
4 Mr. Brown reminded the Circuit Court that Mr. Taggart had moved for a  
5 protective order in the Circuit Court Litigation postdischarge; that he  
6 had filed a motion to dismiss postdischarge, without moving for dismissal  
7 of his counterclaim for attorney's fees; and that he had claimed the  
8 potential award of attorney's fees in the Circuit Court Litigation as an  
9 asset in his bankruptcy. See Exhibit R, at p. 3 (pp. 9-11 of the hearing  
10 transcript). In addition, the Circuit Court presided at the Trial and  
11 thus had the opportunity first-hand to consider whether Mr. Taggart's  
12 interests were represented at the Trial. I do not have a complete  
13 transcript of the Trial to review. See Exhibit 13.

14 In these circumstances, I cannot conclude that the Circuit  
15 Court clearly erred in determining that the Respondents did not violate  
16 Mr. Taggart's discharge injunction under § 524(a)(2) in seeking a  
17 judgment and an award of offsetting, postpetition attorney's fees in the  
18 Circuit Court Litigation.

19 If the standard of review is de novo, my task is more  
20 complicated, but I ultimately likewise conclude that it is not  
21 appropriate to disturb the Circuit Court's findings and conclusions and  
22 further determine that Mr. Taggart's Contempt Motion should be denied for  
23 the following reasons.

24 Deciding the Contempt Motion presents mixed questions of law  
25 and fact. Review of "mixed questions" of law and fact requires  
26 consideration of legal principles and the exercise of judgment about the

1 values underlying those legal principles. Consequently, review is de  
2 novo. Wolkowitz v. Beverly (In re Beverly), 374 B.R. 221, 230 (9th Cir.  
3 BAP 2007) (citing Murray v. Bammer (In re Bammer), 131 F.3d 788, 791-92  
4 (9th Cir. 1997)). In re Beverly and In re Bammer involved determinations  
5 regarding, respectively, a debtor's entitlement to a general discharge  
6 and to the dischargeability of a particular debt. This case involves yet  
7 another determination to be made with respect to the bankruptcy  
8 discharge: the application of the injunction arising upon its entry.  
9 Accordingly, generally, a determination made pursuant to § 524(a)(2) also  
10 is a mixed question of law and fact subject to de novo review.

11 De novo review requires that I consider a matter anew,  
12 independent of any prior decision, as if it had not been heard before.  
13 United States v. Silverman, 861 F.2d 571, 576 (9th Cir. 1988); B-Real,  
14 LLC v. Chaussee (In re Chaussee), 399 B.R. 225, 229 (9th Cir. BAP 2008).

15 Setting aside the Judgment and the Letter Opinion of the  
16 Circuit Court, the record reflects the following as to Mr. Taggart's  
17 participation in the Circuit Court Lawsuit postdischarge:

18 When Mr. Brown subpoenaed Mr. Taggart for a second deposition  
19 in the Circuit Court Lawsuit, Mr. Taggart had Mr. Berman file a motion  
20 for a protective order, requesting that the subpoena be quashed and  
21 further requesting attorney's fees. One day before the Trial, Mr. Berman  
22 filed a motion to dismiss Mr. Taggart from the Circuit Court Lawsuit in  
23 Mr. Taggart's behalf, without offering to dismiss Mr. Taggart's  
24 counterclaim for attorney's fees. That motion was argued on the first  
25 day of Trial, with Mr. Brown arguing that Mr. Taggart was a necessary  
26 party with regard to SPBC's expulsion claim. While recognizing that no

1 money judgment would be entered against Mr. Taggart in light of his  
2 bankruptcy discharge, the Circuit Court denied the motion to dismiss, and  
3 the Trial proceeded. Mr. Berman renewed his motion to dismiss in behalf  
4 of Mr. Taggart orally at the end of the Trial. Mr. Taggart did not  
5 appear or testify at the Trial.

6           Following the Trial, Mr. Berman filed the Objection to Judgment  
7 as "attorney for BT of Sherwood LLC and John Berman," but Mr. Taggart  
8 testified that Mr. Berman prepared the Objection to Judgment, in part,  
9 for him. A substantial portion of the Objection to Judgment, raises and  
10 argues objections in behalf of Mr. Taggart. At the Judgment Hearing, Mr.  
11 Berman told the Circuit Court that Mr. Taggart consented to what Mr.  
12 Berman was arguing, and again, much of Mr. Berman's argument focused on  
13 Mr. Taggart's issues. Mr. Taggart also appeared at the Judgment Hearing  
14 and argued before the Circuit Court. After the Judgment was entered, Mr.  
15 Taggart appealed it. He testified that he was representing himself in  
16 the appeal, but Mr. Berman had helped him in preparing his Notice of  
17 Appeal.

18           At the Hearing, Mr. Taggart testified that the Circuit Court  
19 Lawsuit had precipitated his personal bankruptcy filing. He also  
20 testified that when he filed for bankruptcy protection, he wanted to be  
21 finished with SPBC, he wanted to be freed from his connections with Mr.  
22 Jehnke and Mr. Emmert, and he had no money to fund further participation  
23 in the Circuit Court Lawsuit. In his bankruptcy schedules, he did not  
24 schedule any interest in SPBC or BT, but he did include a potential  
25 attorney's fee award on his counterclaim in the Circuit Court Lawsuit as  
26 an asset.

The foregoing presents a very mixed record. Individually, I am not sure that any of the actions of Mr. Taggart on his own or through Mr. Berman as outlined above would establish that Mr. Taggart renewed active participation in the Circuit Court Lawsuit postdischarge. However, collectively, particularly from the point where the Circuit Court determined that Mr. Taggart's attempted transfer of his member interest in SPBC was ineffective and that he could be expelled from SPBC, I find on de novo review that Mr. Taggart reengaged in the Circuit Court Lawsuit, effectively "reentering the fray" for In re Ybarra purposes. As noted above, the burden of proof to prevail on a motion for contempt is clear and convincing evidence, and I further find that Mr. Taggart has not met that burden.

## Conclusion

To recapitulate: 1) In light of the Circuit Court's application of the correct legal standard, citing In re Ybarra, if I review the Circuit Court's fact findings for clear error, I conclude that the Circuit Court did not clearly err in determining that it was appropriate to grant an offsetting award of postpetition attorney's fees against Mr. Taggart in the Circuit Court Lawsuit. 2) If my review is de novo, I find, based on the record before me, that at some point postdischarge, Mr. Taggart reengaged in the Circuit Court Lawsuit, and he did not meet his burden of proof to establish by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondents willfully violated the discharge injunction provided for in § 524(a)(2).

Based on the foregoing findings of fact and conclusions of law, I will deny Mr. Taggart's Contempt Motion. Mr. Smith or Mr. Streinz

1 should prepare and submit an order denying the Contempt Motion within ten  
2 (10) days following the date of entry of this Memorandum Opinion.

3 ###

4  
5 cc: Damon J. Petticord  
6 James Ray Streinz  
7 John Berman  
8 Tyler Smith  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26